



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,353	06/12/2001	Farhad Mohit	BIZ/01-0003	8754
22874	7590	08/30/2011		
GANZ LAW, P.C. P O BOX 2200 HILLSBORO, OR 97123			EXAMINER FISHER, PAUL R	
			ART UNIT 3689	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 08/30/2011	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mail@ganzlaw.com
uspto@ganzlaw.com

<p align="center"><i>Applicant-Initiated Interview Summary</i></p>	Application No. 09/881,353	Applicant(s) MOHIT ET AL.	
	Examiner PAUL R. FISHER	Art Unit 3689	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) PAUL R. FISHER.

(3) Lloyd L. Pollard II.

(2) Gerardo Araque.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 16 August 2011.

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal [copy given to: ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: ____.

Issues Discussed ☐101 ☐112 ☐102 ☒103 ☐Others
 (For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Search.com.

Substance of Interview

(For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof; claim interpretation; proposed amendments; arguments of any applied references etc...)

See Continuation Sheet.

Applicant recordation instructions: The formal written reply to the last Office action must include the substance of the interview. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, applicant is given a non-extendable period of the longer of one month or thirty days from this interview date, or the mailing date of this interview summary form, whichever is later, to file a statement of the substance of the interview

Examiner recordation instructions: Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recordation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recordation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

☒ Attachment

/Gerardo Araque Jr./
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3689

/PAUL R FISHER/
 Examiner, Art Unit 3689

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR § 1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: On, August 10, 2011, applicant, SPE Mooneyham and Examiner Fisher discussed the following issues over the phone. The instant application is now at the RCE stage. SPE Mooneyham explained to applicant that Examiners are only required to work on one RCE every other bi-week. Thus, the Examiner would be taking this application out of turn. However, Examiner Fisher agreed to look at claim 1 with the applicant if applicant was agreeable to making necessary amendments. The Examiner, SPE, and applicant agreed to hold an interview the next week to discuss claim 1 only. It was also understood that at the interview, the applicant and examiner would discuss how applicant would address remaining claims since claim 1 was the only independent claim being addressed at this interview.

At the interview, applicant's representative described the nature of the invention set forth in claim 1. The Examiner expressed concern with claim 1, stating that the claim language appears to be very broad. Specifically, the examiner asserted that claim 1 does not specifically state the following, as applicant asserts:

modifying an original document to now include annotations or URLs that did not previously exist on the original document .

In other words, there is no limitation requiring an original document which is then annotated by the client computer using the file from the central server. Furthermore, there is no limitation requiring the client computer contain the software to annotate the document using only the key list from the server. The Examiner asserts that from applicant arguments and explanations as to claim 1 being based on Example 1 of the Specification, i.e. "Client-Based Annotation," the actual claim limitations recited in claim 1 are based on Example 2, i.e. "Server-Based Annotation.").

Examiner asserted that in order to overcome the prior art of record, the claim amendments would, according to Example 1, positively claim the fact that the client system is receiving an original non-annotated document, comparing the received document with a key list (which is received and updated from another system), and, based on the key list, annotating the document, i.e. selecting specific terms or phrases (which are found in the key list) and converting them into hyperlinks, as per the example provided on Page 22 - 23 lines 6 - 22 of the applicant's specification wherein it discloses that "The Key Elements are identified through the Key List, and then the identified Key Elements are annotated 6.10 by the Annotator 30 (e.g., by insertion of a URL and identifier), wherein the comparison and conversion process is performed using software that is stored on the client system and wherein the Key Elements are the specific terms or phrases discussed above.

The applicant asserts that "generating annotation instructions for the client system to annotate the content document by annotating one or more key elements in the content document" describe applicant's invention, namely Example 1.

Examiner explained that "annotation instructions" and "annotate the content document by annotating one or more key elements in the content document" are not equivalent to the client system receiving an original un-annotated document, making a comparison between the un-annotated document and the received key list, and converting specific terms and phrases (again the specific terms and phrases that are found in the key list) into a hyperlink. Examiner asserted that the claim limitations of claim 1, as presented, are broad enough to encompass a client computer's web browser receiving HTML code, which provides the web browser, which is on the client system, with instructions to display received content, e.g. web page/web-site, and annotating specific terms or phrases to have them display hyperlinks. This is equivalent to a client web browser receiving, from another system (e.g. server or the link), the home page of, for example, search.com (which is a well known search engine from the 1990's, not of record at this time), wherein search.com included text and hyperlinks, which the web browser, through the HTML code, displayed as, normally, black text (non-hyperlinks) and blue underlined text (hyperlinks, i.e. annotated to have blue text with a blue underline to differentiate it from other text in the document that were not hyperlinks).

While the Examiner was agreeable to making amendments to allow claim 1, the applicant and the examiner could not reach an agreement as to that language.